



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,443	08/09/2001	Mary Louise Parker	515265-2001	4098
32172	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS (6TH AVENUE) 41 ST FL. NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714			COLLINS, DOLORES R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3711	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/925,443	PARKER, MARY LOUISE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dolores R. Collins	3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9, 14-17, 36-39 and 63-66 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 36-39 and 63-66 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 14-17 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Examiner acknowledges response by applicant's representative received 5/2/05.

Examiner further acknowledges the cancellation of claims 18-22 and the addition of claims 63-66.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ide et al. (683).

Ide et al. disclose a Feeding Method And Article, which teaches a substantially flat central portion (as seen in the center of fig. 5), a raised side surface positioned coaxially with a flat central portion (figure 6, (40)) and removable tabs (44): examiner interpreting the removable design-bearing plates as removable tabs with text thereon (page 2, col. 2, lines 38-45 & 59-68).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 7-9 & 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider in view of Ide et al. (683).

Regarding claims 1, 14 & 17

Schneider discloses a Portion Access Pie Plate, which teaches a substantially flat central portion (as seen in the center of figs. 1 & 2), a raised side surface positioned coaxially with the flat central portion (11) and perforations, which define sections of his plate (figure 1, (16)). Further, once the perforated sections are removed, the plate still retains a consistent overall diameter (as seen in figure 2). Schneider fails to teach tabs on his raised surface.

Ide et al. disclose a Feeding Method And Article, which removable tabs (44) with characters printed thereon (page 2, col. 2, lines 59-68). It would have been obvious to

modify Schneider to include removable tabs to add variety to the type of plates available for game play.

Regarding claims 2-3, 7-9 & 15-16

Schneider in view of Ide et al. teaches the claimed invention except for the specific arrangement and/or content of indicia (printed matter) set forth in the claim(s). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include statements questions and answers on the tabs since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of indicia does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Thus, there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter e.g. characters and the substrate e.g. statements (questions/answers) which is required for patentability.

3. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ide et al. (683).

Ide et al. disclose a Feeding Method And Article, which teaches a substantially flat central portion (as seen in the center of fig. 5), a raised side surface positioned coaxially with a flat central portion (figure 6, (40)) and removable tabs (44) with characters printed thereon (page 2, col. 2, lines 59-68).

Ide et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the specific arrangement and/or content of indicia (printed matter) set forth in the claim(s). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include statements questions and answers on the tabs since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of indicia does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Thus, there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter e.g. characters and the substrate e.g. statements (questions/answers) which is required for patentability.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 36-39 & 63-66 are allowed.

Reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter will be held in abeyance pending applicant's response.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/2/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 4, 7 & 14 to include language that is taught by the prior art of record. Removable tabs (44) are taught by Ide et al. Examiner is interpreting the removable design-bearing plates as removable (since they are smaller than the recess in which they sit) tabs with text thereon (page 2, col. 2, lines 38-45 & 59-68). Once these tabs are removed, the shape of the raised side is automatically changed or altered.

In an effort to advance prosecution, examiner invites applicant to schedule an interview regarding this application.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and are cited to show the state of art with respect to features of the claimed invention.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Dolores R. Collins** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4421**. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00 A.M. - 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Greg Vidovich** can be reached on **(571) 272-4415**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).



5/26/05


GREGORY VIDOVICH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700